



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/441,322	05/15/95	ADAMS	8-511827-1

C2M1/0303

JULIAN CAPLAN
FLEHR HOHBACH TEST ALBRITTON & HERBERT
SUITE 3400 FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

EXAMINER
CRONIN, S

ART. UNIT 3207	PAPER NUMBER
-------------------	--------------

03/03/97

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/441,322

Applicant(s)

Adams et al.

Examiner

Stephen K. Cronin

Group Art Unit

3207



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 19, 1996

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,763 in view of Cloyd. U.S. Patent 5,513,763 discloses and claims the invention set forth in the claims except that the central well 51 is closed by a cap 53 instead of the well having a scored portion in its bottom which is self closable. Cloyd teaches a similar closure 12 having a central well 27 with a scored bottom 28 which opens when a probe is inserted and recloses after the probe is removed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the well of U.S. Patent 5,513,763 with a scored bottom as taught by Cloyd instead of installing a separate cap in

Art Unit:

order to obtain the benefit of reducing the number of parts of the closure and further obtain the benefit of the closure being self sealing in the event the probe was removed prior to the container being empty.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed November 19, 1996 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The presently claimed invention sets forth structure, except for that which is encompassed by the prior art of Cloyd, which is fully disclosed and encompassed by the claims of the 5,513,763 patent. The presently claimed invention sets forth structure that is generic to the specific invention set forth in the 5,513,763 patent claims and therefore "reclaims" the previously claimed invention. This is the definition of obvious type double patenting.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit:

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen K. Cronin whose telephone number is (703) 308-4296.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen K. Cronin', is written over a horizontal line.

Stephen K. Cronin

Primary Examiner

March 3, 1997